DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 815 RC 006 704

AUTHOR	Cleland, C. L.
TITLE	Southern Regional Research in Rural Sociology Since the Mid 1950's.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	26p.; Paper presented at the meeting of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Atlanta, Georgia, February 5, 1973
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Agricultural Colleges; *Area Studies; Experiment Stations; *Historical Reviews; Low Income; Regional Cooperation; *Research Projects; *Rural Areas; Social Mobility; *Sociology; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*South

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this historical report is to further the cause of rural sociology in the South. It is based on the author's memory of events relating to research activities, minutes of meetings, correspondence in his files, and selected reports from other rural sociologists in the South. Specifically discussed are the limited personnel in rural sociology, the efforts to initiate regional research, the Southern regional rural sociology projects, the transition from adjustment to mobility, and the transition from mobility to institutional impact. It is concluded that regional research in rural sociology has made progress and that although there have been some problems in continuity of personnel directly involved with the regional projects, a small nucleus has provided some stability. (HBC)

ED 071815

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SOUTHERN REGIONAL RESEARCH IN RURAL SOCIOLOGY SINCE THE MID 1950'S*

C. L. Cleland**

The following report is based on the author's memory of events relating to research activities in the South since his arrival at the University of Tennessee in 1958. His memory has been aided by minutes of meetings, correspondence in his files, and selected reports from other rural sociologists in the South. As with any attempt to write history, there will be some omissions of events or personalities that some feel have had a significant part. There may also be some misinterpretations of events and for these the author accepts full responsibility. It is hoped that the report will serve to further the cause of rural sociology in the South.

Limited Personnel

During the early 1950's the number of rural sociologists who were active in research in the region was fairly limited. This was the case at least for those with direct ties to agricultural experiment stations. Harold Kaufman at Mississippi State was one of those most vocal and energetic in attempting to coordinate some of those research activities. His concern was and continues to be community oriented and it was around such an interest that he attempted to rally support. Alvin Bertrand at Louisiana State also had larger than state interests at heart and was very supportive of regional cooperation even though his main commitment was to the teaching

RC 006704

program. Selz Mayo at North Carolina State also had some larger than state interests but Glenn McCann of the same institution was the younger man who was willing to do more than attend meetings to make regional research go. The University of Kentucky had some real strength in numbers but ties with the North Central Regional Research group were already strong. Milton Coughenour did see the need for coordination and cooperation in the South and so was willing to invest some time and energy to promoting the cause of coordination. William Folkman in Arkansas had a very real concern with the small farm operators and tenants who were having such a difficult time and he too felt the importance of a concerted effort in research in rural sociology in the South.

There were a number of agricultural economists in the South who were also sympathetic to the cause of those who were in difficult straits because of the social situation and were willing to join with rural sociologists to try to work out some regional coordination. Ben Lanham who was at Auburn was one of these. At that time Auburn had no rural sociologist on its staff. Florida was similarly situated except Dan Alleger was making the transition from being an agricultural economist.

At the University of Georgia at this time there were a number of rural sociologists on the staff but none had any connection with the agricultural experiment station. John Belcher, for example, had worked with Sewell and Sharp on farm family level of living studies in Oklahoma. In Virginia rural sociology was given some emphasis with Don Fessler in extension work and Leland Tate in teaching but again there was no tie to the agricultural experiment station for research. At the University of Tennessee there were two agricultural economists who were in training to complete

their doctorates in rural sociology. Howard Bonser was doing his graduate work at Pennsylvania State and Ben Leubke was doing his work at the University of Florida. They both left the University of Tennessee in 1957 and were replaced by Charles Cleland.

Efforts to Initiate Regional Research

USDA support for regional research in general at this time was fairly substantial by then current standards. There was increasing recognition that many of the problems being studied by the individual state experiment stations did not really observe state boundaries. There was the feeling that a significant increase in efficiency in research efforts could be achieved by encouraging scientists in different states working on related problems to coordinate their efforts. The mechanism set up for this was the regional research project. These projects were funded separately from the usual federal funds for agricultural experiment station work. The regional research funds were allocated to the states as a supplement to the Hatch funds which provided the principal support. In the other regions the funds allocated to a particular regional project were distributed among the states involved in the project according to decisions of the technical committee. This approach encouraged station directors to have some representation in virtually every project in the region. In the southern region the directors decided to allocate the regional research funds to the various experiment stations on a formula basis (don't ask me what the formula was!). This permitted the directors to be selective about which regional projects their states participated in. There was no loss of funds to an individual state because of lack of participation in a particular project.

The problem of how to initiate a regional project had not been satisfactorily resolved. There was the requirement that a project statement be submitted to the

regional directors, the Committee of Nine, and to CSRS. This meant that some type of contact had to be made either at professional society meetings or at the researcher's own expense to develop the statement for submission to the various people needing to approve it. The Farm Foundation was assisting the process of getting regional projects formulated by paying the expenses of researchers in various disciplines to regional committees which were appointed by the directors in the region. Knowledge of such support led Kaufman to make contact with Farm Foundation personnel to explore the possibility of such a committee of rural sociologists in the South.

The Farm Foundation director (Joseph Ackerman) was in favor of the appointment of such a committee and indicated that the Foundation would provide support if the directors were interested in having such a committee formed. Eventually the directors agreed to the establishment of a committee whose express purpose was the development of proposals for regional research in rural sociology. This committee was designated as the SP-29 committee which identified it as a committee in preliminary phases of becoming a technical committee for a regional project. The request to the Farm Foundation had been in terms of establishing a Southern Rural Sociology Committee which could have had broader concerns than the one actually established by the southern directors. As a result, when the proposal for a regional project developed by the committee was accepted in 1958, the Farm Foundation group simply went out of existence. The technical committee established to guide the progress of the regional project had representatives from Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas. At later points in time Tennessee, Florida, and Georgia became actively associated with the project.

Dean E. V. Smith was appointed by the southern directors to be the administrative advisor to the technical committee and Paul Jehlik served as the CSRS representative. While Dean Smith had some interest in this area, his technical field was that of animal husbandry. Dean Smith was concerned from the beginning that the rural sociologists should make every effort to impress the southern directors with the results of their research if they were to continue to be funded. He had observed that the meetings of technical committees could become mere social gatherings used to show off the facilities or accomplishments of a given state or individual. Dean Smith was also very strongly oriented toward making the project truly regional in character. The pattern of a "mother hubbard" regional project statement with a number of more or less related independent state projects did not impress him very greatly. With his stimulation and some commitment on the part of the technical committee members, the project soon became one which would permit some generalization to the region, at least to the participating states.

This pattern was soon adopted by CSRS as the standard approach to regional research project statements. Instead of having a very broad regional project statement with individual state projects which could be accepted or refused by the technical committee, the format became a detailed regional project statement with a minimal supplementary indication that a particular state would be involved. The obligations of each of the states was spelled out in the regional project proposal. The proposal made by the SP-29 committee was designated the S-44 project which was a study of the adjustment of families in low income areas. This project was probably the first southern regional project involving survey research which would yield generalizations to the region from the survey data.

The Southern Regional Rural Sociology Projects

The beginnings of the Adjustment Study designated as the S-44 project have been described above. The project itself was a study of poverty in the South at a time when political forces were denying that there was any such thing as poverty in the region. The interest of the researchers at this time was principally one of describing the situation of the families living in these low income rural areas. This interest included setting the information collected through a survey in the proper context with respect to data from secondary sources and other local information sources. Some forces in the South had been interested in the poor people but their voices were few in number and their impact was limited. The Adjustment Study researchers were attempting to document living conditions in a way which could not be easily refuted by the politician or other apologists for the region.

Through the encouragement of Dean Smith and the willingness of the participants in the Adjustment Study to limit the exclusive pursuit of their individual interests, the study became truly regional with a systematicly drawn sample and a carefully developed schedule of questions to be used by the interviewers in the various states. The emphasis in the project became more explicitly sociological with a deemphasis on the economics as agricultural economists were replaced on the technical committee by rural sociologists. Even so the data collected included a large measure of economic information which the sociologists had a little difficulty utilizing as effectively as economists might have.

The Adjustment Study did provide for a great deal of interaction among

the rural sociologists in the South which engendered a strong feeling of commitment to the region. This was reflected in their willingness to collect some data in which various individuals did not have a strong professional interest and to be responsible for certain types of service or data analysis which did not contribute directly to one's own immediate welfare. There was a complete exchange among the participating states of the survey data collected and a division of responsibility for its analysis.

The functioning of the project as a truly regional effort was recognized in the circle of the directors as well as in other groups due largely to the efforts of Dean Smith and Paul Jehlik. The project did prove to be productive in terms of the number of papers, reports, articles, and bulletins which were produced. The names of the principal researchers involved appears in Appendix 1. This appendix also includes a list of the officers who served in each year of the project's existence, the month and place of each annual meeting and the subcommittees which were active during various phases of the project along with the chairmen of such subcommittees.

Transition From Adjustment To Mobility

The S-44 study of adjustment was scheduled to come to a close in mid 1964. The project was granted a one year extension to complete the analyses of the data collected and to publish the results of the study. This time was also used to decide whether to revise the project and get a further extension or to replace it with a new project. During this period approaching the transition, two very active rural sociologists became part of the personnel resources of the South and were very influential in the direction of the regional project work. Bill Kuvlesky moved to Texas A & M from

Pennsylvania State and John Kelley moved to the University of Georgia from San Fernando State College in California.

It was about this time that former President Johnson launched his "War on Poverty" and created the Office of Economic Opportunity. Dean Smith felt that such an organization should have the benefit of our research based knowledge and arranged for a seminar of the Adjustment Study personnel and selected other rural social scientists with some of the top people responsible for the OEO programs. This seminar had about 30 participants and the need for the types of information being provided by the regional projects was brought home very sharply. (See Appendix 2 for a list of the participants.)

One of the principal outcomes of the seminar with OEO was the publication of two volumes which attempted to pull together the numerous reports prepared in connection with the Adjustment Study.* Virlyn Boyd of Clemson who had not been a participant in the earlier study but who had a real interest in the Mobility Study was able to arrange for some free time to gather and publish an annotated bibliography of the Adjustment Study materials along with a separate volume which was a synthesis of the various reports from the study. The experience of dealing with a governmental bureaucratic office at the Washington level was educational for all of the participants.

The Mobility Study got underway early in 1965 in terms of the plans for data collection and the general ideas about analysis even though officially it didn't start until July. The project statement was the result of a number of different interests on the part of rural sociologists who felt that regional research could be worthwhile. In an attempt to incorporate the interests of each of those involved in the deliberations about the project proposal, the final product essentially incorporated three projects

under one heading. The first of these was a follow-up of the Adjustment Study families the second was to involve following the children who had migrated from the Adjustment Study families, and the third one was to concentrate on the aspirations and expectations of high school students both with respect to their education and their future occupations in the areas where the Adjustment Study had been carried out.

The pursuit of the various objectives of the mobility study ultimately depended upon the interest of a given individual or at best a small group of two or three individuals. The interest in pursuing the children of the Adjustment Study families rested principally with C. Horace Hamilton. When Dr. Hamilton experienced some illness and found other areas to be of greater interest, the leadership for this particular part of the project vanished. As a result the technical committee formally dropped that objective about midway in the course of the study.

The productivity in terms of reports, theses, etc., for the Mobility Study came mostly from the group interested in the high school students and most of these were under the direction of Bill Kuvlesky. The follow-up of the Adjustment Study families resulted in very few reports. (See Appendix 3 for a list of the participants and offices held in the technical committee.)

During the course of the mobility study process, there was some concern expressed among the members that there was insufficient time to discuss matters of more general concern to the participants in the project. From 1965 through 1967 the only opportunities for rural sociologists in the South to get together as a regional group occurred through the meetings of the regional project technical committee. The Association of Southern Agricultural Workers did have a section for agriculture

economics and rural sociology but it was clearly dominated by the agricultural economists. Normally there was only a half day session devoted to papers by rural sociologists. While this served the interest of interdisciplinary contact, it did not rank high in professional prestige with the result that little attention was given to such meetings.

There was interest in publicizing the results of the regional research and discussion in the technical committee included emphasis on publication in professional journals as well as through the experiment station bulletin series. Both Dean Smith and Paul Jehlik encouraged such wide spread disemination of the results. They were interested both in letting other social scientists know that a significant bit of research was being carried on in the South and in getting the results to the policy makers to facilitate resolution of the problems identified and described. One of the problems identified was the delay in getting articles published in professional journals because of the backlog of manuscripts which had been accepted for publication. This was but part of the wide variety of topics which would come up for discussion in the technical committee meetings and Dean Smith occasionally had to get the group back on the track of concentrating on the commitment made in the project statement.

Given the limited opportunity for exploring other interests in the technical committee meetings, a renewed interest was expressed in establishing a committee supported by the Farm Foundation which could range freely over the types of research interests of rural sociologists. At the same time the agricultural economists in the region were feeling some of the same problems concerning outlets for publication of research reports and were in the process of organizing a Southern Agricultural Economics Association. This group took the place of the agriculture economics part of the joint section

with rural sociology in the ASAW. It appeared that the action was going to leave the rural sociologists without a meaningful place in the ASAW.

Dan Alleger was scheduled to become chairman of the joint agricultural economics and rural sociology section when the section was dissolved. With the encouragement of John Dunkelberger, Bill Kuvlesky, and some others the decision was made to at least give a rural sociology section of the ASAW a chance and Alleger was asked to serve as chairman. An appeal was made to the Council of ASAW for recognition of a tentative section in rural sociology. The first meeting of the rural sociology section took place in February of 1969. The meeting was well attended and the decision made that the section should continue. Subsequent meetings have vouched for the vitality of the group involved and it is apparently serving a very real need. (See Appendix 4 for a list of the Rural Sociology Section officers.)

At the same time the tentative organization of the ASAW section was underway, there were contacts made with the Farm Foundation to determine the possible interest in supporting a Southern Rural Sociology Committee. Cleland was asked to make such contacts. The response from Joseph Ackerman of the Farm Foundation indicated their willingness to provide the funds but the actual organization would have to be approved and appointed by the southern experiment station directors. The Farm Foundation's willingness was positively expressed with an indication that funds would be budgeted for a meeting of such a committee and would be available whenever its formation was complete. A meeting was arranged for July 26, 1967 involving Joe Ackerman, Dean Smith, Paul Jehlik, Al Bertrand, Harold Kaufman, and Cleland to discuss the specifics of such an organization. A list of names of those who might be

appointed to such a committee was drawn up, a statement of purpose was prepared, and a tentative first meeting date was set up. It was decided at this meeting that the committee would be known as the Southern Rural Sociology Research Committee because the directors of extension in the region were not favorable toward extension participation in such a group at this time. The first meeting of the SRSRC was held in Atlanta on February 15 and 16, 1968.

The SRSRC has continued to be an effective source of ideas about needed research in the region. One of the spin-offs was in the area of demography. When a group of the committee members went to see what resources at Oak Ridge might be used to facilitate their work, the groundwork was laid for the establishment of the Southern Regional Demographic Group which also continues to flourish. Appendix 5 has a list of the officers and committee structure of the SRSRC.

Transition From Mobility To Institutional Impact

The Mobility Study was scheduled to be terminated in the middle of 1971. Again there was a great deal of discussion on what the nature of a revision or replacement project should be. There was a clear recognition that the then current project really was two projects in one and that such a division of interests had interfered with the effective utilization of the time available for the technical committee meetings. The decision was made to replace the single project with two projects. One of those developed was designed to examine the institutional impact on adjustment and to build on the original Adjustment Study. The second project developed dealth with the mobility of the young people who had been interviewed in connection with the Mobility

Study. Dean Smith indicated that the regional directors would probably approve a second rural sociology research project due primarily to the increase emphasis in USDA on social concerns. He suggested that the two project committees should keep in close touch because of the related nature of their concerns.

During calendar 1970 there had been considerable discussion in the Congress about rural development and other expressions about the lot of people living in rural areas. More than fifty bills dealing with the rural development were introduced into the Congress but there was some uncertainty about the funding of any of those bills. Eventually one was passed but the question of funding was still up in the air until near the end of the year when the budget was finally adopted. Once the budget had been adopted and it became apparent to USDA that some funds for rural development research would be available which had to be spent during the current fiscal year, that is June 30, 1971, the call went out to identify projects which would clearly fall into the definition of rural development. There was a hasty reclassification of a large number of projects but there was also encouragement to submit projects which were soon to be submitted anyway.

Some kind of record for cutting red tape in getting a regional project approved must have been set with the Institutional Impact project proposal. The proposal was sent to Dean Smith on January 11, 1971, with approval for the project by the Southern Regional Research Committee, (for the southern directors), by the Committee of Nine and by CSRS, obtained as of February 1, 1971. Dean Smith of course was largely responsible for getting the approval through in such short order. The fact that the project proposal had been in the discussion stage for nearly two

years probably also had something to do with the very ready acceptance of the proposal, that is, the proposal was not something hurriedly whipped up just to take advantage of recently passed appropriations. The first meeting of the technical committee occurred less than two weeks after the proposal had been accepted.

One of the problems in connection with getting the Institutional Impact study underway was that the nine states that were to be involved were also involved in the Mobility Study which had not yet terminated. There was a manpower shortage at the moment. A number of the same people were involved in the SRSRC as well as the rural sociology section of the ASAW with the result that the opportunities for contact were excellent but the efforts to make real progress with the new project cut into the carrying out of some other responsibilities. (See Appendix 6 for a list of the committee personnel and officers.)

The follow up study of Youth Mobility designated as S-81 had a little difficulty getting organized in terms of the specific objectives for the study and the procedures to be followed in achieving them. With Bill Kuvlesky, John Kelley, and John Dunkelberger, assuming a great deal of the leadership, a proposal was developed which was accepted for approval as of July 1, 1971. The annual meetings for the two technical committees were held in the same hotel at the same time in October of that year.

Conclusion

Regional research in rural sociology has made a great deal of progress in the last decade and a half. The initial push by Harold Kaufman along with some

substantial increases in the number of rural sociologists at Experiment Stations in the region and very effective support from Dean Smith have resulted in some very significant achievements. There have been some problems in continuity of personnel directly involved with the regional projects but a small nucleus has provided some stability. The lists of officers and subcommittee chairmen over the years provides some indication of just who these people were. The continuing interest and support of others not directly involved in the projects must also be recognized as important in the effectiveness of these projects. Without the support of department heads, experiment station directors and the USDA (especially CSRS), such achievements would have been extremely difficult. I sincerely hope that the record of these efforts will encourage continued and increased support for such cooperative efforts.

Footnotes

*Paper presented at meeting of Rural Sociology Section of ASAW, Atlanta, Georgia, February 5, 1973.

**Ombudsman and Professor of Rural Sociology, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

1. Virlyn A. Boyd and Carolyn A. Morgan, Synthesis of Findings from Southern Regional Cooperative Research Project S-44: Factors in the Adjustment of Families and Individuals in Low-Income Rural Areas of the South, AE 290, South Carolina AES, March 1966; and Carolyn A. Morgan and Virlyn A. Boyd, Annotated Bibliography of Publications and Reports Resulting from Southern Regional Cooperative Research Project S-44: Factors in the Adjustment of Families and Individuals in Low-Income Rural Areas of the South, AE 289, South Corolina AES, March 1966.

APPENDIX I

Principal professional personnel involved in the S-44 Adjustment Study:
(From S-44 Termination Report)

State or Agency	Personnel
Alabama	John E. Dunkelberger John M. Huie Ben T. Lanham, Jr. Harold L. Nix
Arkansas	William S. Folkman J. L. Charlton
Florida	Daniel E. Alleger
Georgia	John D. Kelley
Kentucky	J. J. Mangalam C. Milton Coughenour A. Lee Coleman Harry K. Schwarzweller
Louisiana	Lee Taylor J.V.D. Saunders
Mississippi	Calvin Vanlandingham Benjamin E. Haddox Harold F. Kaufman John E. Dunkelberger Leslie J. Silverman
North Carolina	Glenn C. McCann Seung Gyu Moon C. Horace Hamilton
Tennessee	Charles L. Cleland

State or Agency	Personnel
Texas	Bardin H. Nelson William P. Kuvlesky Sherman K. Fitzgerald John R. Christiansen
USDA, ERS	E. Grant Youmans Louis J. Ducoff
CSRS Representative	Paul J. Jehlik
Administrative Advisor	Dean E. V. Smith

* * * * * *

S-44 Committee Meetings and Organization
(From annual reports and minutes of meetings)

Year	Month & Place of Meeting	Chairman	Vice-Chairman	Secretary
1959	April, Birmingham	Kaufman	- - - - -	Folkman
1959	October, Memphis Subcommittees: Sampling - Nelson Classification - McCann Schedule - Coughenour	Kaufman	Nelson	McCann
1960	October, Birmingham Subcommittees: Basic Coding - Nelson First Report - Cleland	Nelson	Kaufman	McCann
1961	October, Atlanta Subcommittees: Environmental Data - Dunkelberger Steering - Cleland	Nelson	Cleland	McCann
1962	October, Atlanta	Cleland	- - - - -	Mangalam
1963	October, Atlanta Subcommittee: Project Revision - Taylor	Cleland	Taylor	Mangalam
1964	March, Atlanta October, Atlanta	Cleland	Mangalam	Kelley

* * * * * *

APPENDIX 2

Participants in Joint OEO-CSRS Seminar
(From meeting minutes taken by John Kelley)

Participants present:

Alleger, Daniel E., Florida Agricultural Experiment Station, Gainesville
Boyd, Virlyn A., South Carolina AES, Clemson
Bradley, George, Rural Community Development Service, USDA
Byerly, T. C., Administrator, Cooperative State Research Service, USDA
Cleland, Charles L., Tennessee AES, Knoxville
Cravitz, Sanford, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity
Day, Lee, Economic Research Service, USDA
Drake, Chad, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity
Dunkelberger, John E., Alabama AES, Auburn
Hausler, Richard, Director, Rural Affairs Task Force, OEO and USDA
Hill, Howard, Economic Research Service, USDA
Hjort, Howard, Staff Economist Group, USDA
Inman, Buis, Economic Research Service, USDA
Jehlik, Paul J., Cooperative State Research Service, USDA
John, M. E., Pennsylvania AES, University Park
Kelley, John D., Georgia AES, Athens
Leighday, Jim, Research Policy Planning and Evaluation, OEO
Leonard, Olen, Economic Research Service, USDA
Mangalam, J. J., Kentucky AES, Lexington
Mayo, Selz C., North Carolina AES, Raleigh
McNamara, Robert L., Missouri AES, Columbia
Moon, Seung Gyu, North Carolina AES, Raleigh
Nelson, Bardin H., Texas AES, College Station
Niederfrank, Evlon J., Federal Extension Service, USDA
Slocum, Walter L., Washington AES, Pullman
Smith, E. V., Dean, Alabama AES, Auburn
Sperry, I. V., University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Sugarman, Jule, Deputy Associate Director, Title II, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity
Taylor, M. Lee, Louisiana AES, Baton Rouge
Vanlandingham, Calvin L., Mississippi AES, State College
Weidenheimer, Peggy, Statistical Reporting Service, USDA
White, Bennet, Cooperative State Research Service, USDA
Youmans, E. Grant, Kentucky AES, Lexington

APPENDIX 3

Principal professional personnel involved in the S-61 Mobility Study:
(From S-61 Termination Report)

State or Agency	Personnel
Alabama	John E. Dunkelberger Calvin L. Vanlandingham
Arkansas	Geraldine B. Terry
Florida	Daniel E. Alleger
Georgia	John D. Kelley Melvin Knapp
Kentucky	J. J. Mangalam A. Lee Coleman
Louisiana	Pedro F. Hernandez George Wilber
Mississippi	Elizabeth J. Stojanovic Calvin L. Vanlandingham Gerald O. Windham Arthur G. Cosby
North Carolina	Glenn C. McCann C. Horace Hamilton
South Carolina	Virlyn A. Boyd
Tennessee	Charles L. Cleland
Texas	William P. Kuvlesky W. Kennedy Upham John T. Pelham

State or Agency	Personnel
USDA, ERS	E. Grant Youmans James H. Copp Louis J. Ducoff
CSRS Representative	Paul J. Jehlik
Administrative Advisor	Dean E. V. Smith

* * * * *

S-61 Committee Meetings and Organization
(From annual reports and minutes of meetings)

Year	Month & Place of Meeting	Chairman	Vice-Chairman	Secretary
1965	February, Atlanta October, Atlanta Subcommittees: Restudy - McCann Youth - Kuvlesky	Cleland	Dunkelberger	Kelley
1966	October, Atlanta Subcommittees: Restudy - Dunkelberger Youth - Kuvlesky	Kelley	Cleland	Kuvlesky
1967	October, New Orleans Subcommittees: Restudy - Cleland Youth - Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger	Kelley	Kuvlesky
1968	October, Atlanta Subcommittees: Restudy - Cleland Youth - Hernandez	Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger	Boyd
1969	October, Houston Subcommittees: Restudy - Cleland Youth - Kuvlesky	Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger	Boyd
1970	October, New Orleans	Cleland	Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger

* * * * *

APPENDIX 4

Officers of the Rural Sociology Section of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers (From the section Proceedings)

Year	Month & Place of Meeting (February)	Chairman	Chairman -elect	Secretary, Program Chairman	Secretary, Prog. Chmn., elect
1968-69	Mobile	Alleger	- - - -	Kuvlesky	- - - -
1969-70	Memphis	Alleger	Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger	- - - -
1970-71	Jacksonville	Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger	Sollie	Voland
1971-72	Richmond	Dunkelberger	Sollie	Voland	Boyd
1972-73	Atlanta	Sollie	Voland	Boyd	Cosby

APPENDIX 5

Officers and Organization of the Southern Rural Sociology Research Committee
(From meeting minutes and personal notes.)

Year	Month & Place of Meeting	Chairman	Vice-Chairman	Secretary
1968	February, Atlanta	Cleland	Tate	Skrabanek
	Subcommittees: Delineation of Development Areas - Bertrand Institutional Structure and Change - Kelley Poverty: Dimensions, Causes and Alleviation of - Sollie Demographic and Migration Patterns - Skrabanek			
1969	February, Atlanta	Cleland	Dunkelberger	Sollie
	Subcommittees: Poverty - Sollie Demographic and Migration Patterns - Skrabanek Development Areas and Institutional Structures - Knapp			
1969	November, Atlanta	Dunkelberger	Sollie	Kelley
1970	June, Knoxville	(Officers Continued)		
	Subcommittees: Poverty - Sollie Demographic - Pendelton Education - Kaufman Development - Knapp			
1971	June, Atlanta	Sollie	Kelley	Boyd
1972	- - - -	Sollie	Kelley	Boyd
	Subcommittee: Factors affecting rural sociology in the South - Kuvlesky			

* * * * * *

List of SRSRC State Representatives for 1968

Alabama	Dr. John Dunkelberger
Arkansas	Dr. J. L. Charlton
Georgia	Dr. John Kelley
Florida	Prof. D. E. Alleger
Kentucky	Dr. James S. Brown
Louisiana	Dr. A. L. Bertrand
Mississippi	Dr. Carlton R. Sollie
North Carolina	Dr. Selz Mayo
Oklahoma	None
South Carolina	Dr. V. A. Boyd
Tennessee	Dr. Charles L. Cleland
Texas	Dr. R. L. Skrabanek
Virginia	Dr. Leland B. Tate
At Large	Dr. Harold Kaufman
Representing CSRS	Dr. Paul J. Jehlik
Administrative Advisor	Dean E. V. Smith

APPENDIX 6

Principal professional personnel involved in the S-79 Institutional Impact Study
(From various letters and memory)

State or Agency	Personnel
Alabama	Calvin Vanlandingham Wayne Curtis
Georgia	Max Miller James Tarver
Kentucky	A. Lee Coleman C. Milton Coughenour James Brown
Louisiana	Pedro Hernandez Virginia Steelman
Mississippi	Gerald Windham
North Carolina	Glenn C. McCann
South Carolina	Edward McLean
Tennessee	Charles L. Cleland Ying Nan Lin
Texas	W. Kennedy Upham
CSRS Representatives	Kenneth Wilkinson Harold Capener
Administrative Advisors	Dean E. V. Smith Jarvis Miller

* * * * * *

S-79 Committee Meetings and Organization
(From meeting minutes and personal notes.)

Year	Month & Place of Meeting	Chairman	Vice-Chairman	Secretary
1971	February, Atlanta	Cleland	McCann	Windham
	Subcommittees: Knowledgeables Survey - Miller			
	Household Interviews - McCann			
	Secondary Data Needs - Vanlandingham			
1971	October, Atlanta	Cleland	McCann	Miller
	Subcommittees: Census Data - Upham			
	Other Secondary Data - Vanlandingham			
	Knowledgeables Interviews - Coleman			
	Household Interviews - McCann			
1972	June, Atlanta	McCann	Coleman	Miller